What Did We Hear You Tell Us?

DRAFT

How public & stakeholder input affected alternative development

The CASE Project design team actively sought input from residents nearby and users of College Avenue. Comments received, as well as input received from project stakeholders, were used to develop alternatives that addressed the concerns expressed about the proposed project. Here is some of what we heard:

Greatest concerns regarding project

- Improving safety of pedestrians crossing College Avenue is critical
- Changing pedestrian behavior is necessary to improve safety
- Maintaining left turn access is very important to residents in the study area
- Project aesthetics must fit into the neighborhood surrounding the corridor

Greatest number of comments

1) *What will the impacts be of losing the left-turns in/out of the East Campus Neighborhood (ECN).*
2) *Consider option to start with just the pedestrian crosswalks and signals. Build out center-lane median and barrier infrastructure if safety demands.*
3) *Provide landscaped-median option instead of a structural (i.e., concrete, "ugly") barrier.*

Other comments that influenced the development of alternatives:

- Allow U-turns at the signalized intersections
- Project must include a change in pedestrian behavior to be successful

There were some additional comments received that resulted in options that were considered too challenging to carry into the alternatives screening process, such as:

- **Reducing a lane of traffic on College Avenue (regional impact too severe)**
- **Pedestrian tunnels vs. crossing on surface (too costly; stand-alone it may not result in behavior change)**

Who Did We Hear From?

Over half of those respondents were either residents in the area of the CASE Project or affiliated with the University of Missouri

How Did We Compare Alternatives?

Ultimately, eight alternatives were developed and evaluated based on screening criteria (right). Options were given scores based on how each compared to the others relative to each screening criteria.

Screening Criteria Description	Screening Criteria Score		
♦ Pedestrian Safety	Responsiveness to Criteria	Score	Rank
♦ Change Pedestrian Behavior			
♦ Left Turn Access Maintained	Non-Responsive	0	●
♦ Total Project Cost	Poor	1	●
♦ Appearance Matches Corridor	Fair	3	●
♦ Ease of Maintenance	Excellent	5	●
♦ Corridor Vehicle Travel Time			
♦ Emergency Vehicle Access			
♦ Meets Grant Applic. Description			
♦ Regional Traffic Impact